

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached drawing sheet includes changes to Figure 2. In Figure 2, the reference numbers 54 and 56 are changed to 53 and 55 so that they do not conflict with the references numbers 54 and 56 used in conjunction with Figure 3 and the accompanying description in the specification. A corresponding amendment to the specification is presented to amend the description of Figure 2, accordingly.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed August 30, claims 1-8 and 10 were rejected. Additionally, claim 9 was objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1-5, 7, and 10 are amended, claims 8 and 9 are canceled, and claims 11-19 are added. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite limitations related to the limitations previously recited in claims 8 and 9, which are currently canceled. Each of the amended claims is amended to delete the reference numbers in the drawings. Claim 5 is amended to change the claim dependency. Several of the claims are also amended to clarify the language of the claims. These amendments are supported, for example, by the language of the originally filed claims.

New claims 11-19 are presented to recite various combinations of limitations previously recited claims 1-10. In particular, independent claim 11 recites an attenuator circuit with a plurality of cascaded attenuator stages and a capacitor connected between adjacent attenuator stages. Applicants respectfully submit these amendments are supported by the language of the originally filed claims.

Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Imajo (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0122233, hereinafter Imajo). Additionally, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imajo in view of Farmer et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0253003, hereinafter Farmer). Additionally, claims 4, 6, 7, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imajo in view of Weigand (U.S. Pat. No. 6,489,856, hereinafter Weigand). Additionally, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imajo. Additionally, claim eight was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imajo in view of Kasashima et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,694,069, hereinafter Kasashima). However, Applicants

respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Imajo, Farmer, Weigand, and Kasashima for the reasons provided below.

Claim 1-7 and 10

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-7 and 10 are patentable over the cited references because independent claim 1 recites allowable subject matter. In particular, independent claim 1 recites limitations related to the limitations previously recited in claim 9, which the Office Action recognized as allowable subject matter. Therefore, independent claim 1 is allowable for reciting allowable subject matter. Since claims 2-7 and 10 depend from and incorporate the limitations of independent claim 1, claims 2-7 and 10 also recite allowable separate. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 1-7 and 10 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-19

Applicants submit that claims 11-19 are also patentable over the cited references because independent claim 11 recites allowable subject matter. In particular, independent claim 11 recites a limitation (“a capacitor connected between adjacent attenuator stages”) related to the limitations previously recited in claim 9, which the Office Action recognized as allowable subject matter. Therefore, claim 11 is also allowable for reciting allowable subject. Since claims 12-19 depend from and incorporate the limitations independent claim 11, claims 12-19 also recite allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 11-19 are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: November 30, 2007

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111